

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,720	01/16/2002	Gerard Bonifacio	33900-95	7711
7590 02/03/2004			EXAMINER	
Martin B. Pavane, Esq.			HO, THOMAS Y	
Cohen, Pontani, Lieberman & Pavane Suite 1210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
551 Fifth Avenue			3677	
New York, NY 10176			DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	10/050,720	BONIFACIO, GERARD	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas Y Ho	3677	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the feet of the first of the fi	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		·	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consideration.	dered but does NOT place the	
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-53</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:			
	PB	ILLIAM LAMILLER IMARY EXAMINER	
		/	

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The substantive deletions and changes to the claims require further search and/or consideration. Applicant states that "removing references to the ear is permissible here (i.e., doing so will not create a new issue requiring further consideration and/or search)..." This assumption is incorrect because deleting several lines of the claims (as done in claim 14) changes the scope of the claims, which requires further consideration. Also, further search would be required to determine the effects of the changes in regards to the prior art.